Remarks

Claims 1 through 20 remain pending in the application.

The Office Action rejects independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 18 as anticipated by Karol, Technique For Internetworking Traffic On Connectionless And Connection-Oriented Networks, U.S. Patent 6,628,617 (Sep. 30, 2003) under the assertion that Karol teaches a method and system for enabling storage of data in a computer network comprising a plurality of computer nodes wherein each computer node comprises a connection oriented link layer unit, and that the method disclosed by Karol includes the steps of (1) defining a loop path in the computer network, where the loop path includes computer nodes and connections between the computer nodes and (2) configuring a connection unit at each node along the looping pat supported by the connection oriented link layer unit. The Examiner further asserts that the connection oriented link layer unit is able to send incoming data which is to be stored in the computer network to a next computer node along the looping path and provide the looping path for data and enable storage of data in the computer network.

Karol does not disclose a network in which each node comprises at least one connection oriented link layer unit. Karol discloses several networks in Figure 1, included CL network 110, CL network 130, and CO network 160. As described by Karol, nodes 111 to 112 and 131 to 132 do not have a connection oriented link layer unit. The whole point of Karol's invention is the provision of CL-CO gateways, which would be unnecessary if each node had a COLL. This is because if the

node 112, for example, had a connection oriented (CO) link layer unit, then the node 112 would be directly connected to the node 161 in the CO network; meaning that the node 112 need not be connected to the node 161 via the connectionless – connection oriented (CL-CO) gateway 140. If Karol's nodes did have COLL, his inventive gateway would be superfluous. Because Karol does not disclose a network in which each node comprises at least one connection oriented link layer unit, the independent claims are not anticipated.

Karol clearly does not provide a looping path. To the contrary, Karol teaches against the looping of data and teaches the use of source routing to avoid looping (see for example column 11 paragraph 3 of Karol). It is clear, then, that Karol does not disclose the step of defining a looping path, as required by claim 1. For this additional reason, Karol does not anticipate claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that Karol teaches the step of defining a looping path in the computer network, wherein the looping path comprises a plurality of computer nodes and connections between the computer nodes. However, it can be seen from Figure 1 of Karol that only one possible looping path might be defined, namely, the looping path along the following nodes: 112-121-122-131-132-150-162-161-140-112. It can also be seen from Figure 1 of Karol that it is not possible to define a looping path in the computer network without including the nodes 111 through 112 (which do not have a CO link layer unit). Thus, Karol does not disclose a looping path as defined in claim 1. For this additional reason, Karol does not anticipate claim 1.

The Examiner's assertion that Karol teaches the invention as claimed including "[a] techique for internetworking traffic on connectionless and connection-oriented networks" is not understood. The claimed invention is not directed toward a technique for internetworking traffic on connectionless (CL) and connection-oriented (CO) networks, but is instead directed toward defining a looping path such that data can be stored throughout a network to take advantage of dispersed storage media. Thus, the basis for the rejection seems to be a misunderstanding that the claims are directed to techniques which are irrelevant.

The remaining dependent claims should be allowable given the patentability of the base claims.

Conclusion

This response has addressed all of the Examiner's grounds for rejection. The rejections based on prior art have been traversed. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

Date: March 20, 2008

By: /K. David Crockett/
K. David Crockett, Esq.
Reg. No. 34311